

**STAFF MEETING MINUTES  
LANCASTER COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
COUNTY-CITY BUILDING  
CITY COUNCIL/COUNTY COMMISSIONERS HEARING ROOM  
TUESDAY, MARCH 26, 2002  
3 P.M.**

Commissioners Present: Bob Workman, Chair  
Bernie Heier, Vice Chair  
Kathy Campbell  
Larry Hudkins  
Ray Stevens

Others Present: Kerry Eagan, Chief Administrative Officer  
Gwen Thorpe, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer  
Kathleen Sellman, Planning Director  
Kent Morgan, Assistant Planning Director  
Mike DeKalb, Planning Department  
Bruce Medcalf, County Clerk  
Ann Taylor, County Clerk's Office

The Staff Meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m.

**AGENDA ITEM**

**1 TOUR OF SALINE WETLANDS ALONG LITTLE SALT CREEK AND ROCK CREEK**

Tour of the saline wetlands has tentatively been rescheduled for April 11, 2002, at 1 p.m.

**2 CORRESPONDENCE FROM COUNTY TO PLANNING COMMISSION REGARDING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

The Board reviewed a draft of a letter to the Planning Commission (Exhibit A).

Workman said he believes the "40 acre scenario" needs to be included as an alternative and suggested that the third bullet under Acreage Development be revised to read: Reduce the area required for a community unit plan from 75 to 40 acres in conjunction with a minimum parcel size of 40 acres.

Eagan asked Workman whether his intent is to allow 40 acre parcels to be developed "as a matter of right".

Workman said he is concerned with existing 20 acre parcels and the possibility that a three acre split off may result in abandonment of the remaining 17 acres. He suggested a minimum 40 acre parcel size, with a 20 acre lot density. Workman said it would still be possible to purchase 20 acre parcels, but they would not be buildable. Existing 20 acre farms would be retained, but 40 acres parcels would now be required, with a provision for two lots.

Mike DeKalb, Planning Department, suggested that the first bullet be revised to read: Allow landowners the right to divide two, three acre lots from each 40 acres with appropriate conditions and administrative review.

Heier said he would prefer to keep 20 acres per residence and eliminate the three acre split-off for each 20 acres. He said "Otherwise, you're going to be inundated with three acre lots all over this county."

Hudkins disagreed, stating "If you had 80 acres, you may be able to put four, three acre lots on one 20, but then you're going to have the 60 acres unencumbered." He suggested strengthening the appropriate conditions and administrative review, rather than requiring 40 acres.

DeKalb said under Workman's scenario, you wouldn't get to use the automatic three acre split-off unless you have 40 acres.

Campbell suggested that the first bullet be revised to read: Allow landowners the right to divide three acre lots with one to 20 density on a minimum 40 acre parcel with appropriate conditions and administrative review. She said this adds options and incentives to the "20 acre rule" (sets the minimum lot size at 20 acres in the Agriculture (AG) district).

Hudkins suggested adding a bullet (Bullet #1) to read: Retain the right to split by 20 acres.

In response to a question from Heier, DeKalb explained that the County Zoning Resolution provides for aliquot parts (splitting in equals) to adjust for "short sections", and said one half of a quarter of a quarter (a nominal 20) is deemed a buildable lot.

Campbell suggested adding a fifth bullet to read: Retain exceptions, i.e., one half of a quarter of a quarter and the ability to count road right-of-way.

The Board approved the following changes to the bullets under Acreage Development:

- Retain the right to split by 20 acres
- Allow landowners the right to divide three acre lots with one to 20 density on a minimum 40 acre parcel with appropriate conditions and administrative review

- Reduce the area required for a community unit plan from 75 to 40 acres
- Continue to offer a density bonus for clustering of residential lots
- Retain exceptions, i.e., one half of a quarter of a quarter and the ability to count road right-of-way

The Board also revised the last sentence on Page 1 to read: There are a number of options for implementing this strategy, and the details should be worked out in the County's zoning regulations.

Campbell referred to the draft of the *Lincoln and Lancaster County 2025 Comprehensive Plan* (copy on file in the County Clerk's Office) and suggested the following revisions to the Other Issues section of the letter:

- Request a revision to update the 1987 county acreage criteria, with inclusion of a point/matrix (Strategies for Rural Areas on Page F77)
- Request review of the sufficiency of allocation of land for Tier I: if the community perception is that there is insufficient land designation that may accelerate pressure for urbanization in the rural section of Lancaster County when resources are limited to respond
- Review priority system: completion of one priority before embarking on another may be an artificial benchmark failing to incorporate community interest
- As the planning process proceeds, the public bodies will cross-reference the human services future planning effort with the land use, as appropriate.

The Board agreed with those changes.

Campbell asked Kathleen Sellman, Planning Director, whether the Comprehensive Plan should address long-range planning for the Beltway areas.

Sellman said the federal government will be vigilant in watching an area in which federal funds are used to construct major highway projects to assure themselves that the money is not contributing to "sprawl". She said if specific land uses are designated it may raise a "giant red flag" over that area with regard to potential federal funding.

Heier noted concern with "smoke easements". He also requested definition of the following language on Page F69 of the Comprehensive Plan draft:

*Preserve, protect, and promote city and county historic resources. Preserve, protect and promote the character and unique features of rural and urban neighborhoods, including their historical and architectural elements.*

DeKalb recommended that it be left broad in the policy document.

Hudkins requested that both options for Wildrose Lane (retention or closing) be retained. He said the solution may be to open Fletcher Avenue to Northwest 12<sup>th</sup>, extend Northwest 12<sup>th</sup> over Highway 34 and construct an interchange at Northwest 12<sup>th</sup> and Highway 34.

DeKalb noted that Wildrose Lane closure is included in the list of Proposed Studies on Page F110.

Board consensus to include the following statement in the Other Issues section of the letter:

- Remove reference to the Wild Rose Lane study and replace with a reference to study of an interchange Northwest 12<sup>th</sup> and Highway 34

Kent Morgan, Assistant Planning Director, noted that the map on Page F104 also reflects the closure.

The Board requested inclusion of the following in the Additional Technical Information section of the letter:

- Inclusion of an I-80 corridor study on economic development

Campbell voiced concern that language on Page F20 calls for Wilderness Park to be extended to the south.

The Board requested inclusion of the following in the Other Issues section of the letter:

- Replace "Wilderness Park" and "parkland" with "greenway corridor" on Pages F20 and F62

### **3 ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** Heier moved and Hudkins seconded to adjourn the meeting at 4 p.m. Campbell, Heier, Workman, Hudkins and Stevens voted aye. Motion carried.

---

Bruce Medcalf  
County Clerk